

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PF030094	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/051228	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 24 June 2004 (24.06.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 01 July 2003 (01.07.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant THOMSON LICENSING		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 8 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

<p style="text-align: center;">The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland</p> <p>Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35</p>	<p>Date of issuance of this report 03 January 2006 (03.01.2006)</p> <p>Authorized officer Ellen Moyse</p> <p>Telephone No. +41 22 338 89 75</p>
--	---

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY 27 JAN 2005

WIPO PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/051228

International filing date (day/month/year)
24.06.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
01.07.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
H04N7/24, H04N7/20, H04N5/44, H04N5/00

Applicant
THOMSON LICENSING S.A.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Schneiderlin, J

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7400



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/051228

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/051228

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).
- ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☐ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has:
- ☐ paid additional fees.
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest.
 - ☐ not paid additional fees.
2. ☒ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
 - ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:
see separate sheet
4. Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☒ all parts.
 - ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/051228

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-7
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-7
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-7

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

The following document is referred to in this communication:

D1: WO 01/06768 A (THOMSON LICENSING SA) 25 January 2001

D2: JP 09 326837 A (KOKUSAI ELECTRIC CO LTD) 16 December 1997

D3: WO 01/33817 A (KONINKL PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NV) 10 May 2001

Re Item IV

Lack of unity of invention

This Authority considers that there are 3 inventions covered by the claims:

- I: Claims 1,5,6 directed to avoiding interference by shifting the local oscillator by one or more synthesis intervals.
- II: Claims 2-4 directed to how and when to detect interference.
- III: Claim 7 directed to which amplitude to apply to a shifting of the local oscillator.

The reasons for which the inventions are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept, as required by Rule 13.1 PCT, are as follows:

The common concept of the claims is not inventive over the prior art.

D3 discloses a set top box integrated with a mobile telephone (see fig. 2).

From D1 and D2 it is known to avoid interference by shifting the local oscillator.

The following technical features of claims 1,5,6 make a contribution over the prior art and can be considered as special technical features within the meaning of Rule 13.2 PCT: having a tuner which avoiding interference by shifting the local oscillator by one or more synthesis intervals.

The special technical features of claims 2-4 which make a contribution over the prior art are directed to how and when to detect interference.

The special technical feature of claim 7 which makes a contribution over the prior art is directed to which amplitude to apply to a shifting of the local oscillator.

This appears to show lack of corresponding technical effect because those features are technically very different.

In conclusion, the groups of claims are not linked by common or corresponding special technical features and define 3 different inventions not linked by a single general inventive concept.

The application, hence does not meet the requirements of unity of invention as defined in Rules 13.1 and 13.2 PCT.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/051228

Re Item V

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of independent claim 5 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

D3 discloses a set top box integrated with a mobile telephone (see fig. 2). So the mere fact of including a digital telephone base in a set top box cannot be inventive.

D1 discloses a television receiver which comprises a tuner (see fig. 1) including a local oscillator 116 and a demodulator 108. A program (see page 5, lines 12-21) detects a potential interferer and avoids interferences by shifting the local oscillator. D1 is silent about how to detect an interference. The problem solved by claim 5 can then be seen as how to how to detect an interference. D2 gives the solution of this problem: an error indicator 7,8 included in the demodulator that is used to trigger a modification of the local oscillator.

In claim 6 a slight constructional detail that is present in any digital tuner is introduced. Consequently, the subject-matter of claim 6 also lacks an inventive step.

Independent claim 1 which corresponds to claim 6 in terms of method steps is therefore also not inventive.

Dependent claims 2-4 and 7 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect inventive step, because they are obvious implementation details that a skilled person would consider in accordance with circumstances.